

Objection on February 15, 2024 (ECF No. 19); Plaintiff filed a Reply on February 21, 2024 (ECF No. 21); and, with the Court's permission, the Commissioner filed a Sur-reply (ECF No. 27) and an Amended Response to Plaintiff's Objection (ECF No. 28) on March 18, 2024.

After reviewing and considering the Recommended Decision, together with the entire record, I have made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge. I concur with the Magistrate Judge's conclusions as set forth in her Recommended Decision and determine that no further proceeding is necessary. In so concluding, I emphasize that (1) SSR 96-9p, 1996 WL 374185 (July 2, 1996) does not categorically require Administrative Law Judges to consider all post-hearing submissions related to vocational evidence, and (2) Administrative Law Judges may set and enforce reasonable deadlines for the submission of post-hearing evidence and briefs, including additional vocational evidence.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 17) of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **ACCEPTED**, and the Commissioner's decision (ECF No. 5-2 at 14-55) is **AFFIRMED**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated this 19th day of April, 2024.

/s/ Jon D. Levy
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE